

Dr. Jones, of California, moved to suspend the by-laws at the afternoon session on Thursday, immediately preceding the election of officers, for the purpose of introducing a resolution. The motion to suspend the by-laws was carried unanimously and Dr. Jones introduced a resolution requesting Dr. McCormack to continue his work of organization. In speaking on the resolution, Dr. McCormack called attention to the reported lack of unanimity of feeling among the delegates, and said that his work could not be well done unless every state represented in the House of Delegates was in full understanding and accord with the movement and with the Association. A vote being then taken on the resolution, it was unanimously passed, the best of feeling prevailing and the entire matter being quite fully understood.

We are advised that the new United States Pharmacopeia will be issued from the press on September 1st, and a full review of this new edition will be published in the JOURNAL at some future date. At the present time we wish to call the attention of our members to some very important changes that will go into effect on the 1st of September. The strength of tincture of aconite has been reduced from 35% to 10%, and the strength of tincture of veratrum has been reduced from 40% to 10%. The strength of tincture of strophanthus has been increased from 5% to 10%. These changes have been made in order to bring these potent drugs to the international standards; they will be legally in force and effect on September 1, 1905, and all physicians should remember that fact in prescribing after that date. While we have not space at the present time to dwell at length upon the pharmacopeia, we cannot refrain from emphasizing the fact that it has been greatly neglected by the vast majority of physicians, much to their own injury and to the enriching of the nostrum manufacturers.

Last month the JOURNAL quoted a paragraph from the *St. Louis Medical Review* referring to a garbled account of the Torrici murder case and commented thereon in humorous vein. Our excessively dignified contemporary of St. Louis did not appreciate the humorous side, seems hurt at the "sarcasm" and in turn refers to our now celebrated difference of opinion with the *New York Medical Journal*, and the equally celebrated "retraction," widely advertised throughout the country. But our medical brother of St. Louis did not read the "retraction" in quite the proper way; what we said was: "We do not know that the editorial pages of the *New York Medical Journal* have been bartered for coin." But we do know that at least one physi-

cian in California, has upon two occasions canceled his subscription to that journal for the reason that its columns contained articles of a rather too strong commercial flavor.

Since the days of great prosperity in Rome, and doubtless from a time long prior to that golden epoch, the harlot seems to have joyed in flaunting herself before her less communistic sisters and, in seasons, to have gloried in her own shame. Equally has she patronized her less showily decked and less brazen compatriots and extended a certain friendly sympathy alike to the rake and to the "poor but honest"; to the rake, this seeming sympathy may, perchance, be acceptable.

Some little time ago the *New York Medical Journal*, through its owner and publisher, inadvertently announced to the medical world of this country its separation and complete divorce from those standards of ethics which have seemed good to honest and upright physicians and its allegiance to the elements which make for the very worst influences in medicine—the nostrum and the nostrum maker. The publisher of the *New York Medical Journal* opposed and abused the American Medical Association for the reason that the Association had organized a Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry composed of eminent gentlemen, which Council should calmly consider all remedies submitted to it and do but one simple thing—ascertain whether they were honest preparations honestly placed before medical men, or whether they were secret remedies—nostrums—dishonest preparations, harmful alike to the confiding physician who might use them and to the unfortunate patient who might have to consume them. One can hardly imagine a physician so densely ignorant or so absolutely lost to all self-respect and esteem as not to welcome the formation of a Council having such helpful and such philanthropic purposes in view. The owner and publisher of the *New York Medical Journal* has gone on record as opposing this Council and being favorably disposed to the nostrum manufacturers. He claims that there are 20,000 physicians in this country who help to support his journal by subscribing to it, and apparently flaunts in the face of each one of these presumably self-respecting physicians his absolute disregard for any consideration other than dollars and cents. Indeed, in March the publisher of the *New York Medical Journal* wrote to a number of "manufacturers" suggesting that they furnish their opinions upon the right of nostrum makers to foist their nostrums upon the medical profession, for publication in his journal. Would not this have been truly delectable pabulum on which to feed the 20,000 presumably honest physicians who contribute to the support of the *New York Medical Journal* and its publisher?